

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****DEC 25 2006****REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in light of this submission. Claims 1, 11, 20, and 29 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-31 are presented for examination. All claim amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification, and do not add any new matter.

In the Final Office Action mailed October 13, 2006 (hereinafter "Final Office Action"), the Examiner maintains his rejections of claims 1-31 based on various combinations of U.S. Patent No. 6,999,995 ("Khanna"), U.S. Patent No. 5,905,874 ("Johnson"), U.S. Patent No. 6,333,929 ("Drottar"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,434,651 ("Gentry").

Applicants maintain that none of these references, individually or in combination, teach, disclose, or suggest each and every element of the claims.

Regarding Khanna, the Examiner cites various portions of Khanna to substantiate his argument that Khanna discloses each and every element claims 1, 11, 20, and 29. It appears that the Examiner has interpreted each claim element independently of the other, as these cited portions completely lack nexus to support his position. Applicants do not dispute the basic operations of receiving data, or that data may be latency-sensitive, for example. Clearly, at some point, a computer system may "receive a fragment of electronic data", and clearly, at some point, electronic data may be examined". Furthermore, in

conventional computer systems, interrupts to processors are generated in order that the processor may stop what it's doing to process the data. The Examiner has duly indicated various portions of, for example, Khanna that perform each of these functions in isolation, independently of a preceding element.

However, it is clear that Khanna does not teach, disclose, or suggest examining characteristics of a received fragment of electronic data, where the data is received from a node on a network, and does not teach, disclose, or suggest moderating interrupts if the determined characteristics of the data indicate that such data is latency-sensitive data, nor does Khanna teach, disclose or suggest moderating interrupts based on examining any characteristics of the data. *Of course*, data may be latency-sensitive, and of course, such data may be transferred to memory after the assertion of an interrupt, BUT *Khanna simply does not disclose that the interrupt may be moderated (e.g. asserted or deferred) after examining the data, and after determining the characteristics of the data.* In Khanna, "the asynchronous ISR [is] triggered by receiving of a data packet from the network" (emphasis added, Khanna, column 5, line 67 – column 6, line 1). In other words, in Khanna, an interrupt is asserted by receiving a data packet, NOT by examining the packet FIRST to determine if it is latency-sensitive data.

Many of these same arguments are applicable to Johnson, i.e., it appears that the Examiner has interpreted each claim element independently of the other. In Johnson, as previously argued, data transfer (whether by interrupt to host processor, or DMA, for example) occurs without examining the packets

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****DEC 25 2006**

characteristics of packets are stored in the buffer.

While the claims have been amended, they have been amended to clarify the dependencies of each of the elements on each other. Therefore, Applicants maintain that none of Khanna, Johnson, nor Drottar, individually or in combination, teaches, suggests, or discloses, at the least, for example, an apparatus to "moderate one or more interrupts to a processor if the characteristics of the fragment of electronic data indicate that the fragment of electronic data is latency-sensitive data". Each of the other currently pending independent claims recite limitations that are similar to these limitations, although some differences may exist among the limitations of the other pending independent claims. These similar limitations nevertheless patentably distinguish the claims over the references cited by the Examiner.

Applicants strongly maintain that none of Khanna, Johnson, Drottar, or Gentry teaches, discloses, or suggests each and every element of the pending claims, and therefore respectfully request allowance of the claims as amended.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to initiate an interview with the undersigned by calling 949-498-0601 if the Examiner believes that such an interview will advance prosecution of this application.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****DEC 25 2006****Request for an Extension of Time**


Applicant respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0221 to cover any necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 25, 2006



Libby H. Hope, Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 46,774
Patents and Licensing Group
INTEL CORPORATION

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(949) 498-0601